IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA BRUNSWICK DIVISION

DOUGLAS ASPHALT	§	
COMPANY, JOEL H. SPIVEY,	§	
AND KYLE SPIVEY,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§ Civil Action No:	
	§ 2:06-cv-229-AA	4
VS.	§	
	§	
APPLIED TECHNICAL	§	
SERVICES, INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	
and	§	
	§	
EVANSTON INSURANCE	§	
COMPANY.	§	
	§	
Applicant/Intervenor	\$ §	

EVANSTON'S PROPOSED VERDICT FORM WITH SPECIAL INTERROGATORY QUESTIONS

COMES NOW, Evanston Insurance Company ("Evanston"),
Applicant/Intervenor in the above-styled civil action and files this, its **Proposed**Verdict Form with Special Interrogatory Questions as follows:

1.	We the jury find that the test results provided by ATS to GDOT from its 2003
	and 2004 testing done at the request of GDOT
	were OR
	were not
	privileged communications as that term has been defined to you by the Court.
	If your answer to Question No. 1 is that the "test results provided by ATS to GDOT from its 2003-2004 testing done at the request of GDOT" <u>WERE</u> privileged communications, skip Questions 2, 3, 4, and 5, and proceed to Question 6.
	If your answer to Question No. 1 is that the "test results provided by ATS to GDOT from its 2003-2004 testing done at the request of GDOT" WERE NOT privileged communications, proceed to Question 2.
2.	We the jury find that ATS
	didOR
	did not
	make false statements about Douglas by providing test results from its 2003
	and 2004 testing to GDOT.
	If your answer to Question No. 2 is that ATS " <u>DID</u> make false statements about Douglas by providing of test results from its 2003 and 2004 testing to GDOT," proceed to Question 3.
	If your answer to Question No. 2 is that ATS " <u>DID NOT</u> make false statements about Douglas by providing of test results from its 2003 and 2004 testing to GDOT," skip Questions 3, 4, and 5, and proceed to

Question 6.

3.	We the jury find that test results provided by ATS to GDOT from its 2003-
	2004 testing done at the request of GDOT, which were used by GDOT to place
	Douglas in default
	were OR
	were not
	communicated or published by ATS to third parties other than GDOT and
	GDOT's representatives.
	If your answer to Question No. 3 is that the "results <u>WERE</u> communicated or published by ATS to third parties other than GDOT and GDOT's representatives," proceed to Question 4.
	If your answer to Question No. 3 is that the "results <u>WERE NOT</u> communicated (or published) by ATS to third parties other than GDOT and GDOT's representatives," skip Question 4 and 5, and proceed to Question 6.
4.	We the jury find that ATS
	was OR
	was not
	negligent in the manner in which it tested the samples it received and by
	providing the results it obtained from its testing to GDOT, which resulted
	GDOT placing Douglas in default.
	If your answer to Question No. 4 is that the "ATS WAS negligent in the

If your answer to Question No. 4 is that the "ATS <u>WAS</u> negligent in the manner in which it tested the samples it received and by providing the results it obtained from its testing to GDOT, which resulted GDOT placing Douglas in default,"proceed to Question 5.

If your answer to Question No. 4 is that the "ATS WAS NOT negligent in the manner in which it tested the samples it received and by providing the results it obtained from its testing to GDOT, which resulted GDOT placing Douglas in default" skip Question 5 and proceed to Question 6.

5.	We the jury find that the test results ATS provided to GDOT in 2003 and 2004
	caused OR
	did not cause
	Douglas harm.
6.	We the jury find that the test results provided by ATS to GDOT's lawyers for
	testing done between January 1 and July 14, 2005
	were OR
	were not
	privileged communications as that term has been defined to you by the Court.
	If your answer to Question No. 6 is that the "test results provided by ATS to GDOT's lawyers for testing done between January 1 and July 14, 2005," <u>WERE</u> privileged communications, skip Questions 7, 8, 9 and 10, and proceed to Question 11.
	If your answer to Question No. 6 is that the "test results provided by ATS to GDOT's lawyers for testing done between January 1 and July 14, 2005," <u>WERE NOT</u> privileged communications, proceed to Question 7.
7.	We the jury find that ATS
	didOR

did	not	
-----	-----	--

make false statements about Douglas when ATS provided its test results for testing between January 1 and July 14, 2005, to GDOT 's lawyers.

If your answer to Question No. 7 is that "ATS <u>DID</u> make false statements about Douglas when it provided its test results for testing between January 1 and July 14, 2005, to GDOT 's lawyers," proceed to Question 8.

If your answer to Question No. 7 is that "ATS DID NOT make false statements about Douglas when it provided its post-July 14, 2005 test results to GDOT's lawyers," skip Questions 8, 9, and 10, and proceed to Question 11.

8. We the jury find that ATS

did OR

did not

communicate or publish to third parties, other than GDOT's lawyers, the results of the testing it performed between January 1 and July 14, 2005.

If the answer to Question No. 8 is that the ATS DID communicate or publish to third parties, other than GDOT's lawyers, the results of the testing it performed between January 1 and July 14, 2005," proceed to Question 9.

If the answer to Question No. 8 is that the ATS DID NOT communicate or publish to third parties, other than GDOT's lawyers, the results of the testing it performed between January 1 and July 14, 2005," skip Questions9 and 10, and proceed to Question 11.

9. We the jury find that it

	was OR
	was not
	negligent for ATS to provide the results from its testing performed between
	January 1 and July 14, 2005 to GDOT's attorneys.
	If the answer to Question No. 9 is that it <u>WAS negligent</u> for ATS to provide the results from its testing performed between January 1 and July 14, 2005," proceed to Question 10.
	If the answer to Question No. 9 is that it <u>WAS NOT negligent</u> for ATS to provide the results from its testing performed between January 1 and July 14, 2005," skip Question 10, and proceed to Question 11.
10.	We the jury find that the fact that ATS provided its testing results to GDOT's lawyers from testing it performed after January 1, 2005 and July 14, 2005 caused OR did not cause
11.	We the jury find that the test results provided by ATS to GDOT's lawyers for testing done after July 14, 2005 were OR were not
	If your answer to Question No. 11is that the "test results provided by ATS to GDOT's lawyers for testing done after July 14, 2005," WERE privileged communications, STOP AND DO NOT ANSWER ANY MORE QUESTIONS.

If your answer to Question No. 11 is that the "test results provided by ATS to GDOT's lawyers for testing done after July 14, 2005," WERE NOT privileged communications, proceed to Question 12.

12.	We the jury find that ATS	
	didOR	
	did not	
	make false statements about Douglas when ATS provided its post-July 14,	
	2005 results to GDOT 's lawyers.	

If your answer to Question No. 12is that "ATS DID make false statements about Douglas when it provided its post-July 14, 2005 test results to GDOT 's lawyers," proceed to Question 13.

If your answer to Question No. 12 is that "ATS DID NOT make false statements about Douglas when it provided its post-July 14, 2005 test results to GDOT's lawyers," STOP AND DO NOT ANSWER ANY MORE **QUESTIONS.**

13. We the jury find that ATS

did **OR** did not

communicate or publish to third parties, other than GDOT's lawyers, the results of the testing it performed after July 14, 2005.

If the answer to Question No. 13 is that the ATS DID communicate or publish to third parties, other than GDOT's lawyers, the results of the testing it performed after July 14, 2005," proceed to Question 14.

If the answer to Question No. 13 is that the ATS DID NOT communicate or publish to third parties, other than GDOT's lawyers, the results of the

testing it performed after July 14, 2005," STOP AND DO NOT ANSWER ANY MORE QUESTIONS.

We the jury find that it
was OR
was not
negligent for ATS to provide the results from its testing performed after July
14, 2005 to GDOT's attorneys.
If the answer to Question No. 14 is that it <u>WAS negligent</u> for ATS to provide the results from its testing performed after July 14, 2005," proceed to Question 15.
If the answer to Question No. 14 is that it <u>WAS NOT negligent</u> for ATS to provide the results from its testing performed after July 14, 2005," STOP AND DO NOT ANSWER ANY MORE QUESTIONS.
We the jury find that the fact that ATS provided its testing results to GDOT's
lawyers from testing it performed after July 14, 2005
caused OR
did not cause
Douglas harm.
DO NOT ANSWER OUESTION 16 RELOW LINE ESS VOIL ANSWERED

DO NOT ANSWER QUESTION 16 BELOW UNLESS YOU ANSWERED THAT ATS "CAUSED DOUGLAS HARM" IN RESPONSE TO **QUESTIONS 15.**

If you found that ATS **caused** harm to DOUGLAS by providing the results of its tests post-July 14, 2005 to GDOT's lawyers, what percentage of harm do

	• •		
VOII	attri	hute	to
<i>j</i> 0 0	acti	care	·

- a. the 2003 and 2004 actions of ATS? _____
- b. ATS's actions between January 1, 2005 and July 14, 2005?
- c. ATS's actions after July 14, 2005?

Respectfully submitted, this <u>13th</u> day of <u>September</u>, 2009.

/s/ Peter H. Schmidt, II
PETER H. SCHMIDT, II
Georgia State Bar No: 629512
Attorney for Applicant/Intervenor
Evanston Insurance Company

TAYLOR, ODACHOWSKI, SCHMIDT & CROSSLAND, LLC 300 Oak Street, Suite 200 St. Simons Island, Georgia 31522

Phone: (912) 634-0955 Fax: (912) 638-9739

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA **BRUNSWICK DIVISION**

D O U G L A S A S P H A L T COMPANY, JOEL H. SPIVEY, AND KYLE SPIVEY,	§ § § §
Plaintiffs,	§ Civil Action No:
	§ 2:06-cv-229-AAA
VS.	§
	§
APPLIED TECHNICAL	§
SERVICES, INC.,	§
	§
Defendant.	§
	§
and	§
	§
EVANSTON INSURANCE	§
COMPANY.	§
A 11 /T	§
Applicant/Intervenor	§

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This hereby certifies that on this day, I electronically filed the **Evanston's** Proposed Verdict Form with Special Interrogatory Questions with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will automatically send email notification of such filing to the following attorneys of record:

Paul W. Burke, Esq. B.Kaye Katz-Flexer, Esq. Brent J. Savage, Esq. William H. Pinson, Jr., Esq. Eric Mull. Esq. SAVAGE, TURNER, PINSON & KARSMAN DREW, ECKL & FARNHAM, LLP 304 East Bay Street 880 West Peachtree Street Savannah, Georgia 31401 Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Kenneth E. Futch, Jr., Esq. THE FUTCH LAW FIRM 110 Screven Avenue Waycross, Georgia 31501

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Douglas Asphalt Company

James Cook Edward H. Lindsey, Jr., Esq. David M. Abercrombie, Esq.

GOODMAN McGuffey Lindsey &

JOHNSON LLP

3340 Peachtree Road, NE

Atlanta, Georgia 30326-1084

Attorneys for Defendant Applied Technical Services, Inc

Respectfully submitted, this 13th day of September, 2009.

/s/ Peter H. Schmidt, II
PETER H. SCHMIDT, II
Georgia State Bar No: 629512

Attorney for Applicant/Intervenor Evanston Insurance Company

Taylor, Odachowski, Schmidt & Crossland, LLC 300 Oak Street, Suite 200 St. Simons Island, Georgia 31522

Phone: (912) 634-0955 Fax: (912) 638-9739